arXiv:1606.09640v4 [math.RT] 17 Nov 2016

CHARACTERS OF HIGHEST WEIGHT MODULES AND INTEGRABILITY

GURBIR DHILLON AND APOORVA KHARE
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Abstract. We give positive formulas for the weights of every simple highest weight module $L(\lambda)$ over an arbitrary Kac–Moody algebra. Under a mild condition on the highest weight, we express the weights of $L(\lambda)$ as an alternating sum similar to the Weyl–Kac character formula. For general highest weight modules, we answer questions of Bump and Lepowsky on weights, and a question of Brion on the corresponding D-modules. Many of these results are new even in finite type. We prove similar assertions for highest weight modules over a symmetrizable quantum group.

These results are obtained as elaborations of two ideas. First, the following data attached to a highest weight module are equivalent: (i) its integrability, (ii) the convex hull of its weights, (iii) the Weyl group symmetry of its character, and (iv) when a localization theorem is available, its behavior on certain codimension one Schubert cells. Second, for special classes of highest weight modules, including simple modules, the above data determine the weights.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex semisimple Lie algebra, W its Weyl group, and fix a triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$. A problem of longstanding interest is to obtain positive character formulae for its simple highest weight modules, $L(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

With this motivation, in this paper we provide several such formulae for the weights of $L(\lambda)$, i.e. determining for what $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the multiplicity of the eigenspace $L(\lambda)_\mu$ is nonzero. We also obtain a version of the Weyl–Kac character formula for $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$, i.e. involving only signs but no Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials.

Moreover, we obtain these results for $\mathfrak{g}$ an arbitrary Kac–Moody algebra, and the obtained descriptions of $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ are particularly striking in infinite type. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is affine the formulae are insensitive to whether λ is critical or non-critical. In contrast, critical level modules, which figure prominently in the Geometric Langlands program [1, 10, 11], behave very differently from noncritical modules, even at the level of characters. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable we similarly obtain weight formulae at critical λ. The authors are unaware of even conjectural formulae for $\operatorname{ch} L(\lambda)$ in this case. Finally, when $\mathfrak{g}$ is non-symmetrizable, it is unknown how to compute weight space multiplicities even for integrable $L(\lambda)$. Thus for $\mathfrak{g}$ non-symmetrizable, our formulae provide as much information on $\operatorname{ch} L(\lambda)$ as one could hope for, given existing methods.

The aforementioned results emerge from a more general study of highest weight $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, whose main ideas are distilled in the following theorem:

Date: November 18, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 17B10; Secondary: 17B67, 22E47, 17B37, 20G42.

Key words and phrases. Highest weight module, parabolic Verma module, integrable Weyl group, Tits cone, Weyl–Kac formula, weight formula, Beilinson–Bernstein localization, quantum group.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Kac–Moody algebra with simple roots $\alpha_i, i \in I$. Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, and let V be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight λ. The following data are equivalent:*

(1) *I_V, the integrability of V, i.e. $I_V = \{i \in I : f_i$ acts locally nilpotently on $V\}$.*
(2) *$\operatorname{conv} V$, the convex hull of the weights of V.*
(3) *The stabilizer of the character of V in W.*

Moreover, if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of finite type, write $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ for the corresponding perverse sheaf on the flag variety, and X_w for its supporting Schubert variety. Then the data in (1)–(3) are equivalent to:

(4) *$I_{\mathcal{V}_{rh}} = \{i \in I :$ the stalks of $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ along the Schubert cell $C_{s_i w}$ are nonzero$\}$.*

Under this equivalence, $I_V = I_{\mathcal{V}_{rh}}$. Moreover, for special classes of highest weight modules, including simple modules, these data determine the weights.

The datum of Theorem 1.1 is an accessible, 'first-order' invariant, yet the equivalence of its manifestations (1)–(4) has otherwise non-obvious consequences in the study of highest weight modules. In our applications, it is the connection to convexity that seems to have not been fully utilized in the literature. Besides the results for $L(\lambda)$ mentioned above, we apply Theorem 1.1 to answer questions of Daniel Bump and James Lepowsky on the weights of highest weight modules, and a question of Michel Brion concerning localization of the corresponding D-modules on the flag variety.

2. Statements of results

Throughout the paper, unless otherwise specified $\mathfrak{g}$ is a Kac–Moody algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ with triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$, and V is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

The paper is structured as follows: after introducing notation in Section 3, we prove in Section 4 the main result. In Sections 5–8, we develop different applications of the main result. Finally, in Section 9, we discuss extensions of the previous sections to quantized enveloping algebras.

The ordering of this section is parallel to the organization of the paper and we refer the reader to Section 3 for notation.

2.1. A classification of highest weight modules to first order.

In the first section, we prove the equivalence of data (1)–(3) discussed in Theorem 1.1, which we repeat below for the reader's convenience. Let $\pi = \{\alpha_i, i \in I\}$ denote the set of simple roots of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Theorem 2.1. *The following data are equivalent:*

(1) *I_V, the integrability of V, i.e. $I_V := \{i \in I : f_i$ acts locally nilpotently on $V\}$.*
(2) *$\operatorname{conv} V$, the convex hull of the weights of V.*
(3) *The stabilizer of $\operatorname{conv} V$ in W.*

In particular, the convex hull in (2) is always that of the parabolic Verma module $M(\lambda, I_V)$, and the stabilizer in (3) is always the parabolic subgroup W_{I_V}.

The difficult implication in Theorem 2.1 is that the natural map $M(\lambda, I_V) \otimes V_\lambda \to V$ induces an equality on convex hulls of weights, where V_λ is the highest weight line of V. To our knowledge this implication, and in particular the theorem, is new for $\mathfrak{g}$ of both finite and infinite type.

2.2. **A question of Bump on the weights of non-integrable simple modules.** In this section we obtain three positive formulas for the weights of simple highest weight modules, $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$, corresponding to the manifestations (1)–(3) of the datum of Theorem 1.1.

The first formula uses restriction to the maximal standard Levi subalgebra whose action is integrable:

Proposition 2.2. *Write $\mathfrak{l}$ for the Levi subalgebra corresponding to $I_{L(\lambda)}$, and write $L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\nu)$ for the simple $\mathfrak{l}$ module of highest weight $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi \setminus \pi_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{2.3}$$

The second formula explicitly shows the relationship between $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda)$ and its convex hull:

Proposition 2.4.

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{conv} L(\lambda) \cap \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : \mu \leqslant \lambda\}. \tag{2.5}$$

The third formula uses the Weyl group action, and a parabolic analogue of the dominant chamber introduced in Section 3.3:

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose λ has finite stabilizer in $W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}\{\mu \in P^+_{I_{L(\lambda)}} : \mu \leqslant \lambda\}. \tag{2.7}$$

We remind that the assumption that λ has finite stabilizer is very mild, cf. Proposition 3.2(4).

The question of whether Proposition 2.4 holds, namely, whether the weights of simple highest weight modules are no finer an invariant than their hull, was raised by Daniel Bump. Propositions 2.2, 2.4, and 2.6 are well known for integrable $L(\lambda)$, and Propositions 2.2 and 2.4 were proved by the second named author in finite type [22]. The remaining cases, in particular Proposition 2.6 in all types, are to our knowledge new.

We obtain the above three formulae using the following theorem. For V a general highest weight module, it gives a necessary and sufficient condition for $M(\lambda, I_V) \to V$ to induce an equality of weights, in terms of the action of a certain Levi subalgebra. Define the *potential integrability* of V to be $I^p_V := I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus I_V$. To justify the terminology, note that these are precisely the simple directions which become integrable in quotients of V.

Theorem 2.8. *Let V be a highest weight module, V_λ its highest weight line. Let $\mathfrak{l}$ denote the Levi subalgebra corresponding to I^p_V. Then* $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I_V)$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{l})V_\lambda = \operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{l})M(\lambda, I_V)_\lambda$, *i.e.* $\operatorname{wt} U(\mathfrak{l})V_\lambda = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I^p_V}$.

In particular, if $V = L(\lambda)$, then $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I_{L(\lambda)})$.

Theorem 2.8 is new in both finite and infinite type.

2.3. **A question of Lepowsky on the weights of highest weight modules.** In this section, we revisit the problem encountered in the proof of Propositions 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, namely under what circumstances does the datum of Theorem 1.1 determine $\operatorname{wt} V$.

It was noticed by the second named author in [22] that $\operatorname{wt} V$ is a finer invariant than $\operatorname{conv} V$ whenever the potential integrability I^p_V contains orthogonal roots. The prototypical example here is for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2 \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2$, and $V = M(0)/M(s_1 s_2 \cdot 0)$.

James Lepowsky asked whether this orthogonality is the only obstruction to determining $\operatorname{wt} V$ from its convex hull. In finite type, this would reduce to a question in types A_2, B_2, and G_2. We now answer this question affirmatively for $\mathfrak{g}$ an arbitrary Kac–Moody algebra.

Theorem 2.9. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$. Every highest weight module V of highest weight λ and integrability J has the same weights if and only if $I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J$ is complete, i.e. $(\check{\alpha}_i, \alpha_j) \neq 0, \forall i, j \in I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J$.*

We are not aware of a precursor to Theorem 2.9 in the literature, even in finite type.

2.4. **The Weyl–Kac formula for the weights of simple modules.** We formulate and prove the following theorem, whose notation we will explain below.

Theorem 2.10. *For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that the stabilizer of λ in $W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$ is finite, we have:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} w \frac{e^{\lambda}}{\prod_{i \in I}(1 - e^{-\alpha_i})}. \tag{2.11}$$

On the left hand side of (2.11) we mean the 'multiplicity-free' character $\sum_{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : L(\lambda)_\mu \neq 0} e^{\mu}$. On the right hand side of (2.11), in each summand we take the 'highest weight' expansion of $w(1 - e^{-\alpha_i})^{-1}$, i.e.:

$$w \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\alpha_i}} := \begin{cases} 1 + e^{-w\alpha_i} + e^{-2w\alpha_i} + \cdots, & w\alpha_i > 0, \\ -e^{w\alpha_i} - e^{2w\alpha_i} - e^{3w\alpha_i} - \cdots, & w\alpha_i < 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, as claimed in the introduction, each summand comes with signs but no multiplicities as in Kazhdan–Lusztig theory.

Theorem 2.10 was known in the case of $L(\lambda)$ integrable [21, 31]. As pointed out to us by Michel Brion, in finite type Theorem 2.10 follows from a more general formula for exponential sums over polyhedra, cf. Remark 7.6. All other cases are to our knowledge new.

2.5. **A question of Brion on localization of D-modules and a geometric interpretation of integrability.** In this section we use a topological manifestation of the datum in Theorem 1.1 to answer a question of Brion in geometric representation theory.

Brion's question is as follows. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of finite type, λ a regular dominant integral weight, and consider $\operatorname{conv} L(\lambda)$, the Weyl polytope. For any $J \subset I$, if one intersects the tangent cones of $\operatorname{conv} L(\lambda)$ at $w\lambda, w \in W_J$, one obtains $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$. Brion first asked whether an analogous formula holds for other highest weight modules. We answer this question affirmatively in [8].

Brion further observed that this procedure of localizing $\operatorname{conv} L(\lambda)$ in convex geometry is the shadow of a localization in complex geometry. More precisely, let X denote the flag variety, and $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ denote the line bundle on X with $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \simeq L(\lambda)$. As usual, write X_w for the closure of the Bruhat cell $C_w := BwB/B$, $\forall w \in W$, and write $w_\circ$ for the longest element of W. Let $\mathbb{D}$ denote the standard dualities on Category $\mathcal{O}$ and regular holonomic D-modules. Then for a union of Schubert divisors $Z = \cup_{i \in I \setminus J} X_{s_i w_\circ}$ with complement U, we have $H^0(U, \mathcal{L}_\lambda) \simeq \mathbb{D}M(\lambda, J)$. Thus in this case localization of the convex hull could be recovered as taking the convex hull of the weights of sections of $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ on an appropriate open set U. Brion asked whether a similar result holds for more general highest weight modules.

We answer this affirmatively for a regular integral infinitesimal character. By translation, it suffices to examine the regular block $\mathcal{O}_0$.

Theorem 2.12. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of finite type, and $\lambda = w \cdot -2\rho$. Let V be a $\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight λ, and write $\mathcal{V}$ for the corresponding D-module on X. For $J \subset I_V$, set $Z = \cup_{i \in I_V \setminus J} X_{s_i w}$, and write $G/B = Z \sqcup \tilde{U}$. Then we have: $\mathbb{D}H^0(\tilde{U}, \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V})$ is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module of highest weight λ and integrability J.*

Let us mention one ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2.12. Let $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ denote the perverse sheaf corresponding to $\mathcal{V}$ under the Riemann–Hilbert correspondence. Then the datum of Theorem 1.1 manifests as:

Proposition 2.13. *For $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$, consider the smooth open subvariety of X_w given on complex points by:*

$$\mathcal{U}_J := C_w \sqcup \bigsqcup_{i \in J} C_{s_i w}. \tag{2.14}$$

Letting $V, \mathcal{V}_{rh}$ be as above, upon restricting to $\mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$ we have:

$$\mathcal{V}_{rh}|_{\mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} \simeq j_! \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}}[\ell(w)]. \tag{2.15}$$

In particular, $I_V = \{i \in I : \text{the stalks of } \mathcal{V}_{rh} \text{ along } C_{s_i w} \text{ are nonzero}\}$.

To our knowledge Proposition 2.13 is new, though not difficult to prove once stated. The proof is a pleasing geometric avatar of the idea that $M(\lambda, I_V) \to V$ is an isomorphism 'to first order'.

2.6. **Highest weight modules over symmetrizable quantum groups.** In the final section, we apply both the methods and the results from earlier to study highest weight modules over quantum groups, and obtain results similar to those discussed above.

2.7. **Further problems.** We conclude this section by calling attention to two problems suggested by this work which we feel are interesting.

Problem 1. *Weyl–Kac formula with infinite stabilizers.* As we prove, Theorem 2.10 holds under the assumption that the highest weight has finite integrable stabilizer. However, it otherwise tends to fail in interesting ways. For example, for $\mathfrak{g}$ of rank 2 and the trivial module $L(0)$, one obtains:

$$\sum_{w \in W} w \frac{1}{(1 - e^{-\alpha_1})(1 - e^{-\alpha_2})} = 1 + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_-^{im}} e^{\alpha}. \tag{2.16}$$

It would be interesting to formulate a correct version of Theorem 2.10 even for one-dimensional modules in affine type, which might be thought of as a multiplicity-free Macdonald identity. Indeed, Equation (2.16) suggests correction terms coming from imaginary roots.

Problem 2. *From convex hulls to weights.* The regular block of Category $\mathcal{O}$ is the prototypical example of a category of infinite-dimensional $\mathfrak{g}$-modules, of perverse sheaves on a stratified space, and of a highest weight category. Accordingly, it has very rich representation-theoretic, geometric, and purely categorical structure. The main theorem of the paper, Theorem 1.1, determines the meaning of the convex hull of the weights in these three guises, namely: the integrability, behavior in codimension one, and the Jordan–Hölder content $[V : L(s_i \cdot \lambda)]$. It would be very interesting to obtain a similar understanding of the weights themselves.

2.8. **Acknowledgments.** It is a pleasure to thank Michel Brion, Daniel Bump, Shrawan Kumar, James Lepowsky, Sam Raskin, Geordie Williamson, and Zhiwei Yun for valuable discussions. The work of G.D. was partially supported by the Department of Defense (DoD) through the NDSEG fellowship.

3. Preliminaries and notations

The contents of this section are mostly standard. We advise the reader to skim Subsection 3.3, and refer back to the rest only as needed.

3.1. **Notation for numbers and sums.** We write $\mathbb{Z}$ for the integers, and $\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ for the rational, real, and complex numbers respectively. For a subset S of a real vector space E, we write $\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}S$ for the set of finite linear combinations of S with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}$, and similarly $\mathbb{Z}S, \mathbb{Q}^{\geqslant 0}S, \mathbb{R}S$, etc.

3.2. **Notation for Kac–Moody algebras, standard parabolic and Levi subalgebras.** The basic references are [19] and [25]. In this paper we work throughout over $\mathbb{C}$. Let I be a finite set, and $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ a generalized Cartan matrix. Fix a realization, $(\mathfrak{h}, \pi, \check{\pi})$, with simple roots $\pi = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ and coroots $\check{\pi} = \{\check{\alpha}_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}$ satisfying $(\check{\alpha}_i, \alpha_j) = a_{ij}, \forall i, j \in I$.

Let $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{g}(A)$ be the associated Kac–Moody algebra generated by $\{e_i, f_i : i \in I\}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$, modulo the relations:

$$[e_i, f_j] = \delta_{ij}\check{\alpha}_i, \quad [h, e_i] = (h, \alpha_i)e_i, \quad [h, f_i] = -(h, \alpha_i)f_i, \quad [\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}] = 0, \quad \forall h \in \mathfrak{h},\ i, j \in I,$$
$$(\text{ad } e_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(e_j) = 0, \quad (\text{ad } f_i)^{1-a_{ij}}(f_j) = 0, \quad \forall i, j \in I,\ i \neq j.$$

Denote by $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}(A)$ the quotient of $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ by the largest ideal intersecting $\mathfrak{h}$ trivially; these coincide when A is symmetrizable. When A is clear from context, we will abbreviate these to $\mathfrak{g}, \overline{\mathfrak{g}}$.

In the following we establish notation for $\mathfrak{g}$; the same apply for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ *mutatis mutandis*. Let Δ^+, Δ^- denote the sets of positive and negative roots, respectively. We write $\alpha > 0$ for $\alpha \in \Delta^+$, and similarly $\alpha < 0$ for $\alpha \in \Delta^-$. For a sum of roots $\beta = \sum_{i \in I} k_i \alpha_i$ with all $k_i \geqslant 0$, write $\operatorname{supp} \beta := \{i \in I : k_i \neq 0\}$. Write

$$\mathfrak{n}^- := \bigoplus_{\alpha < 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \qquad \mathfrak{n}^+ := \bigoplus_{\alpha > 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Let $\leqslant$ denote the standard partial order on $\mathfrak{h}^*$, i.e. for $\mu, \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $\mu \leqslant \lambda$ if and only if $\lambda - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi$.

For any $J \subset I$, let $\mathfrak{l}_J$ denote the associated Levi subalgebra generated by $\{e_i, f_i : i \in J\}$ and $\mathfrak{h}$. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ write $L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda)$ for the simple $\mathfrak{l}_J$-module of highest weight λ. Writing A_J for the principal submatrix $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in J}$, we may (non-canonically) realize $\mathfrak{g}(A_J) =: \mathfrak{g}_J$ as a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}(A)$. Now write $\pi_J, \Delta_J^+, \Delta_J^-$ for the simple, positive, and negative roots of $\mathfrak{g}(A_J)$ in $\mathfrak{h}^*$, respectively (note these are independent of the choice of realization). Finally, we define the associated Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{u}_J^+, \mathfrak{u}_J^-, \mathfrak{n}_J^+, \mathfrak{n}_J^-$ by:

$$\mathfrak{u}_J^\pm := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^\pm \setminus \Delta_J^\pm} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \qquad \mathfrak{n}_J^\pm := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_J^\pm} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha,$$

and $\mathfrak{p}_J := \mathfrak{l}_J \oplus \mathfrak{u}_J^+$ to be the associated parabolic subalgebra.

3.3. **Weyl group, parabolic subgroups, Tits cone.** Write W for the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$, generated by the simple reflections $\{s_i, i \in I\}$, and let $\ell : W \to \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}$ be the associated length function. For $J \subset I$, let W_J denote the parabolic subgroup of W generated by $\{s_j, j \in J\}$.

Write P^+ for the dominant integral weights, i.e. $\{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_i, \mu) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}, \forall i \in I\}$. The following choice is non-standard. Define the real subspace $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_i, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i \in I\}$. Now define the *dominant chamber* as $D := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_i, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}, \forall i \in I\} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$, and the *Tits cone* as $C := \bigcup_{w \in W} wD$.

Remark 3.1. In [25] and [19], the authors define $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ to be a real form of $\mathfrak{h}^*$. This is smaller than our definition whenever the generalized Cartan matrix A is non-invertible, and has the consequence that the dominant integral weights are not all in the dominant chamber, unlike

for us. This is a superficial difference, but our convention helps avoid constantly introducing arguments like [25, Lemma 8.3.2].

We will also need parabolic analogues of the above. For $J \subset I$, define $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}(J) := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_j, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}, \forall j \in J\}$, the J *dominant chamber* as $D_J := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_j, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}, \forall j \in J\}$, and the J *Tits cone* as $C_J := \bigcup_{w \in W_J} wD_J$. Finally, we write P^+_J for the J dominant integral weights, i.e. $\{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (\check{\alpha}_j, \mu) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}, \forall j \in J\}$. The following standard properties will be used without further reference in the paper:

Proposition 3.2. *For $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ with realization $(\mathfrak{h}, \pi, \check{\pi})$, let $\mathfrak{g}(A^t)$ be the dual algebra with realization $(\mathfrak{h}^*, \check{\pi}, \pi)$. Write $\check{\Delta}^+_J$ for the positive roots of the standard Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}^t_J \subset \mathfrak{g}(A^t)$.*

1. *For $\mu \in D_J$, the isotropy group $\{w \in W_J : w\mu = \mu\}$ is generated by the simple reflections it contains.*
2. *The J dominant chamber is a fundamental domain for the action of W_J on the J Tits cone, i.e., every W_J orbit in C_J meets D_J in precisely one point.*
3. *$C_J = \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}(J) : (\check{\alpha}, \mu) < 0$ for at most finitely many $\check{\alpha} \in \check{\Delta}^+_J\}$; in particular, C_J is a convex cone.*
4. *Consider C_J as a subset of $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}(J)$ in the analytic topology, and fix $\mu \in C_J$. Then μ is an interior point of C_J if and only if the isotropy group $\{w \in W_J : w\mu = \mu\}$ is finite.*

Proof. The reader can easily check that the standard arguments, cf. [25, Proposition 1.4.2], apply in this setting *mutatis mutandis*. □

We also fix $\rho \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying $(\check{\alpha}_i, \rho) = 1, \forall i \in I$, and define the *dot action* of W via $w \cdot \mu := w(\mu + \rho) - \rho$; this does not depend on the choice of ρ.

3.4. **Representations, integrability, and parabolic Verma modules.** Given an $\mathfrak{h}$-module M and $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, write M_μ for the corresponding simple eigenspace of M, i.e. $M_\mu := \{m \in M : hm = (h, \mu)m \ \forall h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$, and write $\operatorname{wt} M := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^* : M_\mu \neq 0\}$.

Let V be a highest weight $\mathfrak{g}$-module with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. For $J \subset I$, we say V is J *integrable* if f_j acts locally nilpotently on V, $\forall j \in J$. The following standard lemma may be deduced from [25, Lemma 1.3.3] and the proof of [25, Lemma 1.3.5].

Lemma 3.3.

1. *If V is of highest weight λ, then V is J integrable if and only if f_j acts nilpotently on the highest weight line V_λ, $\forall j \in J$.*
2. *If V is J integrable, then* $\operatorname{ch} V$ *is W_J-invariant.*

Let I_V denote the maximal J for which V is J integrable, i.e.,

$$I_V = \{i \in I : (\check{\alpha}_i, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}, f_i^{(\check{\alpha}_i, \lambda)+1} V_\lambda = 0\}. \tag{3.4}$$

We will call W_{I_V} the *integrable Weyl group*.

We next remind the basic properties of parabolic Verma modules over Kac–Moody algebras. These are also known in the literature as generalized Verma modules, e.g. in the original papers by Lepowsky (see [26] and the references therein).

Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and a subset J of $I_{L(\lambda)} = \{i \in I : (\check{\alpha}_i, \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\}$. The parabolic Verma module $M(\lambda, J)$ co-represents the following functor from $\mathfrak{g}$-mod to Set:

$$M \rightsquigarrow \{m \in M_\lambda : \mathfrak{n}^+ m = 0, \ f_j \text{ acts nilpotently on } m, \forall j \in J\}. \tag{3.5}$$

When J is empty, we simply write $M(\lambda)$ for the Verma module. From the definition and Lemma 3.3, it follows that $M(\lambda, J)$ is a highest weight module that is J integrable.

More generally, for any subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}_J \subset \mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, the module $M_{\mathfrak{s}}(\lambda, J)$ will co-represent the functor from $\mathfrak{s}$-mod to Set:

$$M \rightsquigarrow \{m \in M_\lambda : (\mathfrak{n}^+ \cap \mathfrak{s})m = 0,\ f_j \text{ acts nilpotently on } m, \forall j \in J\}. \tag{3.6}$$

We will only be concerned with $\mathfrak{s}$ equal to a Levi or parabolic subalgebra. Finally, in accordance with the literature, in the case of "full integrability" we define $L^{\max}(\lambda) := M(\lambda, I)$ for $\lambda \in P^+$, and similarly $L^{\max}_{\mathfrak{p}_J}(\lambda) := M_{\mathfrak{p}_J}(\lambda, J)$ and $L^{\max}_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda) := M_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda, J)$ for $\lambda \in P^+_J$.

Proposition 3.7 (Basic formulae for parabolic Verma modules)**.** *Let $\lambda \in P^+_J$.*

(1) $M(\lambda, J) \simeq M(\lambda)/(f_j^{(\check{\alpha}_j, \lambda)+1} M(\lambda)_\lambda, \forall j \in J)$.
(2) *Given a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}_J \subset \mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, define $\mathfrak{s}^+_J := \mathfrak{l}_J \oplus (\mathfrak{u}^+_J \cap \mathfrak{s})$. Then:*

$$M_{\mathfrak{s}}(\lambda, J) \simeq \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{s}}_{\mathfrak{s}^+_J} \mathrm{Res}^{\mathfrak{l}_J}_{\mathfrak{s}^+_J} L^{\max}_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda), \tag{3.8}$$

where we view $\mathfrak{l}_J$ as a quotient of $\mathfrak{s}^+_J$ via the short exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathfrak{u}^+_J \cap \mathfrak{s} \to \mathfrak{s}^+_J \to \mathfrak{l}_J \to 0.$$

In particular, for $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{g}$:

$$\mathrm{wt}\, M(\lambda, J) = \mathrm{wt}\, L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda) - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_J). \tag{3.9}$$

We remark that some authors use the term inflation (from $\mathfrak{l}_J$ to $\mathfrak{s}^+_J$) in place of $\mathrm{Res}^{\mathfrak{l}_J}_{\mathfrak{s}^+_J}$.

4. A classification of highest weight modules to first order

In this section we prove the main result of the paper, Theorem 1.1, except for the perverse sheaf formulation (4), which we address in Section 8. The two tools we use are: (i) an "Integrable Slice Decomposition" of the weights of parabolic Verma modules $M(\lambda, J)$, which extends a previous construction in [22] to representations of Kac–Moody algebras; and (ii) a "Ray Decomposition" of the convex hull of these weights, which is novel in all types for non-integrable modules.

4.1. The Integrable Slice Decomposition.

The following is the technical heart of this section.

Proposition 4.1 (Integrable Slice Decomposition)**.**

$$\mathrm{wt}\, M(\lambda, J) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_J)} \mathrm{wt}\, L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{4.2}$$

In particular, $\mathrm{wt}\, M(\lambda, J)$ *lies in the J Tits cone (cf. Section 3.3).*

In proving Proposition 4.1 and below, the following results will be of use to us:

Proposition 4.3 ([19, §11.2 and Proposition 11.3(a)])**.** *For $\lambda \in P^+$, $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, say μ is* non-degenerate with respect to λ *if $\mu \leqslant \lambda$ and λ is not perpendicular to any connected component of* $\mathrm{supp}(\lambda - \mu)$*. Let V be an integrable module of highest weight λ.*

(1) *If $\mu \in P^+$, then $\mu \in \mathrm{wt}\, V$ if and only if μ is non-degenerate with respect to λ.*
(2) *If the sub-diagram on $\{i \in I : (\check{\alpha}_i, \lambda) = 0\}$ is a disjoint union of diagrams of finite type, then $\mu \in P^+$ is non-degenerate with respect to λ if and only if $\mu \leqslant \lambda$.*
(3) $\mathrm{wt}\, V = (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi) \cap \mathrm{conv}(W\lambda)$.

Proposition 4.3 is explicitly stated in [19] for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$, but also holds for $\mathfrak{g}$. To see this, note that $\operatorname{wt} V \subset (\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi) \cap \operatorname{conv}(W\lambda)$, and the latter are the weights of its simple quotient $L(\lambda)$, which is inflated from $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The disjointness of the terms on the right-hand side is an easy consequence of the linear independence of simple roots.

We first show the inclusion $\supset$. Recall the isomorphism of Proposition 3.7:

$$M(\lambda, J) \simeq M(\lambda)/(f_j^{(\check{\alpha}_j,\lambda)+1} M(\lambda)_\lambda, \forall j \in J).$$

It follows that the weights of $\ker(M(\lambda) \to M(\lambda, J))$ are contained in $\bigcup_{j\in J}\{\nu \leqslant s_j \cdot \lambda\}$. Hence $\lambda - \mu$ is a weight of $M(\lambda, J), \forall \mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I\setminus J}$. Any nonzero element of $M(\lambda, J)_{\lambda-\mu}$ generates an integrable highest weight $\mathfrak{l}_J$-module. As the weights of all such modules coincide by Proposition 4.3(3), this shows the inclusion $\supset$.

We next show the inclusion $\subset$. For any $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I\setminus J}$, the 'integrable slice'

$$S_\mu := \bigoplus_{\nu\in\lambda-\mu+\mathbb{Z}\pi_J} M(\lambda, J)_\nu$$

lies in Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{l}_J$, and is furthermore an integrable $\mathfrak{l}_J$-module. It follows that the weights of $M(\lambda, J)$ lie in the J Tits cone.

Let ν be a weight of $M(\lambda, J)$, and write $\lambda - \nu = \mu_J + \mu_{I\setminus J}, \mu_J \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_J, \mu_{I\setminus J} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I\setminus J}$. We need to show $\nu \in \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda - \mu_{I\setminus J})$. By W_J-invariance, we may assume ν is J dominant. By Proposition 4.3, it suffices to show that ν is non-degenerate with respect to $(\lambda - \mu_{I\setminus J})$. To see this, using Proposition 3.7 write:

$$\nu = \lambda - \mu_L - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \beta_k, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda - \mu_L \in \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\lambda),\ \beta_k \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_J^+,\ 1 \leqslant k \leqslant n.$$

The claimed nondegeneracy follows from the fact that $\lambda - \mu_L$ is nondegenerate with respect to λ and that the support of each β_k is connected. □

As an immediate consequence of the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1, we present a family of decompositions of $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$, which interpolates between the two sides of Equation (4.2):

Corollary 4.4. *For subsets $J \subset J' \subset I$, we have:*

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J) = \bigsqcup_{\mu\in\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi\setminus\pi_{J'})} \operatorname{wt} M_{\mathfrak{l}_{J'}}(\lambda - \mu, J), \tag{4.5}$$

where $M_{\mathfrak{l}_{J'}}(\lambda, J)$ was defined in Equation (3.6).

As a second consequence, Proposition 4.3(2) and the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1 yield the following simple description of the weights of most parabolic Verma modules.

Corollary 4.6. *Suppose λ has finite W_J-isotropy. Then,*

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J) = \bigcup_{w\in W_J} w\{\nu \in P_J^+ : \nu \leqslant \lambda\}. \tag{4.7}$$

Equipped with the Integrable Slice Decomposition, we provide a characterization of the weights of a parabolic Verma module that will be helpful in Section 5.

Proposition 4.8.

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J) = (\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\pi) \cap \operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J). \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. The inclusion $\subset$ is immediate. For the reverse $\supset$, note that $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$ lies in the J Tits cone and is W_J invariant. It then suffices to consider a point ν of the right-hand side which is J dominant. Write ν as a convex combination:

$$\nu = \sum_{k=1}^{n} t_k(\lambda - \mu^k_{I\setminus J} - \mu^k_J),$$

where $t_k \in \mathbb{R}^{>0}, \sum_k t_k = 1, \mu^k_{I\setminus J} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I\setminus J}, \mu^k_J \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_J, 1 \leqslant k \leqslant n$. By Propositions 4.3 and 4.1, it remains to observe that ν is non-degenerate with respect to $\lambda - \sum_k t_k \mu^k_{I\setminus J}$, as a similar statement holds for each summand. □

4.2. **The Ray Decomposition.** Using the Integrable Slice Decomposition, we obtain the following description of $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$, which is of use in the proof of the main theorem and throughout the paper.

Proposition 4.10 (Ray Decomposition)**.**

$$\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J) = \operatorname{conv} \bigcup_{w \in W_J,\ i \in I\setminus J} w(\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\alpha_i). \tag{4.11}$$

When $J = I$, by the right-hand side we mean $\operatorname{conv} \bigcup_{w\in W} w\lambda$.

Proof. The containment $\supset$ is straightforward using the definition of integrability and W_J invariance. For the containment $\subset$, it suffices to show every weight of $M(\lambda, J)$ lies in the right-hand side. Note that the right-hand side contains $W_J(\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I\setminus J})$, so we are done by the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1. □

4.3. **Proof of the main result.** With the Integrable Slice and Ray Decompositions in hand, we now prove our main theorem.

Theorem 4.12. *Given a highest weight module V and a subset $J \subset I$, the following are equivalent:*

(1) $J = I_V$.
(2) $\operatorname{conv} \operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{conv} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$.
(3) *The stabilizer of* $\operatorname{conv} V$ *in W is W_J.*

The connection to perverse sheaves promised in Section 1 is proven in Proposition 8.2.

Proof. To show (1) implies (2), note that $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\alpha_i \subset \operatorname{wt} V, \forall i \in \pi_{I\setminus I_V}$. The implication now follows from the Ray Decomposition 4.10. The remaining implications follow from the assertion that the stabilizer of $\operatorname{conv} V$ in W is W_{I_V}. Thus, it remains to prove the assertion. It is standard that W_{I_V} preserves $\operatorname{conv} V$. For the reverse, since (1) implies (2), we may reduce to the case of $V = M(\lambda, J)$. Suppose $w \in W$ stabilizes $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$. It is easy to see λ is an (exposed) face of $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$, hence so is $w\lambda$. However by the Ray Decomposition 4.10, it is clear that the only 0-faces of $\operatorname{conv} M(\lambda, J)$ are $W_J(\lambda)$, so without loss of generality we may assume w stabilizes λ.

Recalling that W_J is exactly the subgroup of W which preserves $\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_J$, it suffices to show w preserves $\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_J$. Let $\alpha \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_J$; then by Proposition 3.7, $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\alpha \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$, whence so is $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}w(\alpha)$ by Proposition 4.8. This shows that $w(\alpha) > 0$; it remains to show $w(\alpha) \notin \Delta^+_J$. It suffices to check this for the simple roots $\alpha_i, i \in I \setminus J$. Suppose not, i.e. $w(\alpha_i) \in \Delta^+_J$ for some $i \in I \setminus J$. In this case, note $w(\alpha_i)$ must be a real root of Δ^+_J, e.g. by considering $2w(\alpha_i)$. Thus the $w(\alpha_i)$ root string $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}w(\alpha_i)$ is the set of weights of an integrable representation of $\mathfrak{g}_{-w(\alpha_i)} \oplus [\mathfrak{g}_{-w(\alpha_i)}, \mathfrak{g}_{w(\alpha_i)}] \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{w(\alpha_i)} \simeq \mathfrak{sl}_2$, which is absurd. □

Corollary 4.13. *The stabilizer of* $\operatorname{ch} V$ *in* W *is* W_{I_V}.

Corollary 4.14. *For any* V, $\operatorname{conv} V$ *is the Minkowski sum of* $\operatorname{conv} W_{I_V}(\lambda)$ *and the cone* $\mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0} W_{I_V}(\pi_{I \setminus I_V})$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.12, we reduce to the case of V a parabolic Verma module. Now the result follows from the Ray Decomposition 4.10 and Equation (3.9). □

Remark 4.15. For $\mathfrak{g}$ semisimple, the main theorem 4.12 and the Ray Decomposition 4.10 imply that the convex hull of weights of any highest weight module V is a W_{I_V}-invariant polyhedron. To our knowledge, this was known for many but not all highest weight modules [22]. We develop many other applications of the main theorem to the convex geometry of $\operatorname{conv} V$, including the classification of its faces and their inclusions, in the companion work [8].

5. A question of Bump on the weights of non-integrable simple modules

In this section, we use the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1 and the main theorem 1.1 to obtain several positive formulas for the weights of the simple modules $L(\lambda)$, and affirmatively answer a question of Daniel Bump discussed in Section 2.2.

Let V be a highest weight module, $M(\lambda, I_V)$ its parabolic Verma cover, and recall that the *potentially integrable* simple directions are $I_V^p = I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus I_V$. The formulas for weights of simple modules will arise as consequences of the following:

Theorem 5.1. $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I_V)$ *if and only if* $\operatorname{wt}_{I_V^p} V = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I_V^p}$. *In particular, if* V *is simple, or more generally* $|I_V^p| \leqslant 1$, *then* $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I_V)$.

Proof. It is clear, e.g. by the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1 that if $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I_V)$, then $\operatorname{wt}_{I_V^p} V = \lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I_V^p}$. For the reverse implication, by again using the Integrable Slice Decomposition and the action of $\mathfrak{l}_{I_V}$, it suffices to show that $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I \setminus I_V} \subset \operatorname{wt} V$.

Suppose not, i.e. there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I \setminus I_V}$ with $V_{\lambda - \mu} = 0$. We decompose $I \setminus I_V = I_V^p \sqcup I^q$, and write accordingly $\mu = \mu_p + \mu_q$, where $\mu_p \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I_V^p}$ and $\mu_q \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I^q}$. By assumption $V_{\lambda - \mu_p}$ is nonzero, so by the PBW theorem, there exists $\partial \in U(\mathfrak{n}^-_{I_V^p})$ of weight $-\mu_p$ such that $\partial \cdot V_\lambda$ is nonzero. Now choose an enumeration of $I^q = \{i_k : 1 \leqslant k \leqslant n\}$, write $\mu_q = \sum_k m_k \alpha_{i_k}$, and consider the monomials $E := \prod_k e_{i_k}^{m_k}, F := \prod_k f_{i_k}^{m_k}$. By the vanishing of $V_{\lambda - \mu_p - \mu_q}, \partial F$ annihilates the highest weight line V_λ, whence so does $E\partial F$. Since $[e_i, f_j] = 0 \ \forall i \neq j$, we may write this as $\partial \prod_k e_{i_k}^{m_k} f_{i_k}^{m_k}$, and each factor $e_{i_k}^{m_k} f_{i_k}^{m_k}$ acts on V_λ by a nonzero scalar, a contradiction. □

Remark 5.2. Given the delicacy of Jantzen's criterion for the simplicity of a parabolic Verma module (see [16, 17]), it is interesting that the equality on weights of $L(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda, I_{L(\lambda)})$ always holds.

The following results are immediate consequences of combining Theorem 5.1 with Propositions 4.1 and 4.8 and Corollary 4.6 respectively.

Proposition 5.3. *Fix* $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ *and let* $\mathfrak{l}$ *be the Levi corresponding to* $I_{L(\lambda)}$. *Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_{I_{L(\lambda)}})} \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\lambda - \mu). \tag{5.4}$$

Proposition 5.5. $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = (\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\pi) \cap \operatorname{conv} L(\lambda)$.

Proposition 5.6. *Suppose λ has finite $W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$-isotropy. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \bigcup_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} w\{\nu \in P^+_{I_{L(\lambda)}} : \nu \leqslant \lambda\}. \tag{5.7}$$

For an extension of Proposition 5.6 to arbitrary λ, see the companion work [8].

6. A question of Lepowsky on the weights of highest weight modules

In Section 5, we applied our main result to obtain formulas for the weights of simple modules. We now answer a question of Lepowsky, discussed in Section 2.3, which explores the extent to which this can be done for arbitrary highest weight modules.

Theorem 6.1. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, and $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$. Then all highest weight modules V with highest weight λ and integrability J have the same weights if and only if $J^p := I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J$ is complete, i.e. $(\check{\alpha}_j, \alpha_{j'}) \neq 0, \forall j, j' \in J^p$.*

Proof. If J^p is not complete, pick $j, j' \in J^p$ with $(\check{\alpha}_j, \alpha_{j'}) = 0$. Then $M(\lambda, J)$ and $M(\lambda, J)/s_j s_{j'} \cdot M(\lambda, J)_\lambda$ have distinct weights, as can be seen by a calculation in type $A_1 \times A_1$. Conversely, suppose J^p is complete. By Theorem 5.1 we may assume that $J^p = I$. For each $i \in I$, note that V admits a quotient with integrability $I \setminus i$. Again by Theorem 5.1, we may estimate $\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I \setminus i) \subset \operatorname{wt} V$, whence it suffices to prove:

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I \setminus i).$$

To see this, for $i \in I$, using the assumption that every node is connected to i, and the representation theory of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$, one shows:

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, I \setminus i) \supset \{\lambda - \sum_{j \in I} k_j \alpha_j : k_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}, k_i \geqslant k_j, \forall j \in I\}. \qquad \square$$

The lower bounds on $\operatorname{wt} V$ implicit in the proof of Theorem 6.1 are sharp. Namely, there is a *minimal* quotient $L(\lambda, J)$ of $M(\lambda)$ with integrability J. Thus, we can formulate Lepowsky's question as asking when $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda, J) = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J)$.

Explicitly, $L(\lambda, J)$ is the quotient of $M(\lambda)$ by the sum of all submodules N such that $N_{s_i \cdot \lambda} = 0, i \notin J$. This construction of $L(\lambda, J)$ is parallel to that of $L(\lambda)$ – in fact, $L(\lambda) = L(\lambda, I_{L(\lambda)})$. In particular, the character $\operatorname{ch} L(\lambda, J)$ is not apparent. However, it often turns out to be no more difficult than $\operatorname{ch} L(\lambda)$, and is obtained by the following construction.

Proposition 6.2. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*, J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$. Suppose that $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{O}}(L(\lambda), L(s_i \cdot \lambda)) \neq 0, \ \forall i \in I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J$. Then there is a short exact sequence:*

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{i \in I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J} L(s_i \cdot \lambda) \to L(\lambda, J) \to L(\lambda) \to 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Proof. The choice of a nonzero class in each $\operatorname{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{O}}(L(\lambda), L(s_i \cdot \lambda)), i \in I_{L(\lambda)} \setminus J$ gives an extension E as in Equation (6.3). The space E_λ is a highest weight line, and we obtain an associated map $M(\lambda) \simeq M(\lambda) \otimes E_\lambda \to E$. This is surjective, as follows from an easy argument using Jordan-Hölder content and the nontriviality of each extension. The consequent surjection $E \to L(\lambda, J)$ is an isomorphism, by considering Jordan-Hölder content. $\square$

By identifying the relevant extension groups with $\mathrm{Hom}(N(\lambda), L(s_i \cdot \lambda))$, where $N(\lambda)$ is the maximal submodule of $M(\lambda)$, one sees they are at most one dimensional. They are always nonzero in finite type, by Kazhdan–Lusztig theory [15, 32], and also nonzero when λ is dominant integral and $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable. We expect the hypotheses in Proposition 6.2 to hold in most cases of interest, e.g. for λ in the dot orbit of a dominant integral weight.

7. The Weyl–Kac formula for the weights of simple modules

The goal of this section is to prove the following:

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be such that the stabilizer of λ in $W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$ is finite. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} w \frac{e^{\lambda}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \pi}(1 - e^{-\alpha})}. \tag{7.2}$$

The expansion of each summand was explained in Section 2.4. We emphasize that the above formula involves signs but no multiplicities.

Precursors to Theorem 7.1 include Kass [21], Brion [6], Walton [33], Postnikov [30], and Schützer [31] for integrable modules.

By Theorem 5.1, we will deduce Theorem 7.1 from the following:

Proposition 7.3. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$ such that the stabilizer of λ in W_J is finite. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda, J) = \sum_{w \in W_J} w \frac{e^{\lambda}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \pi}(1 - e^{-\alpha})}.$$

Proof. By expanding $w \prod_{\alpha \in \pi_{I \setminus J}} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-1}$, note the right hand side equals:

$$\sum_{w \in W_J} \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0} \pi_{I \setminus J}} w \frac{e^{\lambda - \mu}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \pi_J}(1 - e^{-\alpha})}.$$

Therefore we are done by the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1 and the existing result for integrable highest weight modules with finite stabilizer [21]. □

Specialized to the trivial module in finite type, we obtain the following curious consequence, which roughly looks a Weyl denominator formula without a choice of positive roots:

Corollary 7.4. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be of finite type with root system Δ, and let Π denote the set of all π, where π is a simple system of roots for Δ. Then we have:*

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta} (1 - e^{\alpha}) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \prod_{\beta \notin \pi} (1 - e^{\beta}). \tag{7.5}$$

Remark 7.6. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is of finite type, Theorem 7.1 follows from Proposition 2.4 and general formulae for exponential sums over polyhedra [6], [3, Chapter 13]. For regular weights, one uses that the tangent cones are unimodular, and for general highest weights one may apply a deformation argument due to Postnikov [30]. We thank Michel Brion for sharing this observation with us.

Moreover, it is likely that a similar approach works in infinite type, though a cutoff argument needs to be made owing to the fact that $\operatorname{conv} V$ is in general locally, but not globally, polyhedral, cf. our companion work [8].

Note the similarity between Proposition 7.3 and the following formulation of the Weyl–Kac character formula. This is due to Atiyah and Bott for finite dimensional simple modules in finite type, but appears to be new in this generality:

Proposition 7.7. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$. Then:*

$$\operatorname{ch} M(\lambda, J) = \sum_{w \in W_J} w \frac{e^{\lambda}}{\prod_{\alpha>0}(1-e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}}. \tag{7.8}$$

The right hand side of Equation (7.8) is expanded in the manner explained above. The equality may be deduced from the usual presentation of the parabolic Weyl–Kac character formula:

Proposition 7.9. *Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*, J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$. Then:*

$$\operatorname{ch} M(\lambda, J) = \sum_{w \in W_J} \frac{e^{w(\lambda+\rho)-\rho}}{\prod_{\alpha>0}(1-e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}}. \tag{7.10}$$

To our knowledge, even Proposition 7.9 does not appear in the literature in this generality. However, via Levi induction one may reduce to the case of λ dominant integral, $J = I$, where it is a famed result of Kumar [23, 24]. Along these lines, we also record the BGGL resolution for arbitrary parabolic Verma modules, which may be of independent interest:

Proposition 7.11. *Fix $M(\lambda, J)$ and $J' \subset J$. Then $M(\lambda, J)$ admits a BGGL resolution, i.e., there is an exact sequence:*

$$\cdots \to \bigoplus_{w \in W_J^{J'}: \ell(w)=2} M(w \cdot \lambda, J') \to \bigoplus_{w \in W_J^{J'}: \ell(w)=1} M(w \cdot \lambda, J') \to M(\lambda, J') \to M(\lambda, J) \to 0. \tag{7.12}$$

Here $W_J^{J'}$ runs over the minimal length coset representatives of $W_{J'} \backslash W_J$. In particular, we have the Weyl–Kac character formula:

$$\operatorname{ch} M(\lambda, J) = \sum_{w \in W_J^{J'}} (-1)^{\ell(w)} \operatorname{ch} M(w \cdot \lambda, J'). \tag{7.13}$$

This can be deduced by Levi induction from the result of Heckenberger and Kolb [13], which builds on [12, 24, 29].

Remark 7.14. As the remainder of the paper concerns only symmetrizable $\mathfrak{g}$, we now explain the validity of earlier results for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ (cf. Section 3.2). The proofs in Sections 4–7 prior to Remark 7.6 apply verbatim for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$. Alternatively, recalling that the roots of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ coincide [19, §5.12], it follows from Equation (3.9) and the remarks following Proposition 4.3 that the weights of parabolic Verma modules for $\mathfrak{g}, \overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ coincide, as do the weights of simple highest weight modules. Hence many of the previous results can be deduced directly for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ from the case of $\mathfrak{g}$. These arguments for $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$ apply for any intermediate Lie algebra between $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{g}}$.

8. A question of Brion on localization of D-modules and a geometric interpretation of integrability

Throughout this section, $\mathfrak{g}$ is of finite type. We will answer the question of Brion [7] discussed in Section 2.5. We first introduce notation. For λ a dominant integral weight, consider $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$, the line bundle on G/B with $H^0(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) \simeq L(\lambda)$ as $\mathfrak{g}$-modules. For $w \in W$, write $C_w := BwB/B$ for the Schubert cell, and write X_w for its closure, the Schubert variety.

Let V be a highest weight module with highest weight $w \cdot (-2\rho), w \in W$. Write $\mathcal{V}$ for the corresponding regular holonomic D-module on G/B, and $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ for the corresponding perverse sheaf under the Riemann–Hilbert correspondence. Then $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}_{rh}$ are supported on X_w. Note that for $i \in I_V$, $X_{s_i w}$ is a Schubert divisor of X_w. We will use $\mathbb{D}$ to denote the standard dualities on Category $\mathcal{O}$, regular holonomic D-modules, and perverse sheaves, which are intertwined by Beilinson–Bernstein localization and the Riemann–Hilbert correspondence.

Theorem 8.1. *For $V, \mathcal{V}$ as above, and $J \subset I_V$, consider the union of Schubert divisors $Z := \cup_{i \in I_V \setminus J} X_{s_i w}$. Write $\tilde{U} := G/B \setminus Z$. Then $\mathbb{D}H^0(\tilde{U}, \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V})$ is of highest weight $w \cdot (-2\rho)$ and has integrability J.*

To prove Theorem 8.1, we will use the following geometric characterization of integrability, which was promised in Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 8.2. *For $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$, consider the smooth open subvariety of X_w given on complex points by:*

$$\mathcal{U}_J := C_w \sqcup \bigsqcup_{i \in J} C_{s_i w}. \tag{8.3}$$

Let $V, \mathcal{V}_{rh}$ be as above, and set $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$. Upon restricting to $\mathcal{U}$ we have:

$$\mathcal{V}_{rh}|_{\mathcal{U}} \simeq j_! \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}}[\ell(w)]. \tag{8.4}$$

In particular, $I_V = \{i \in I : \text{the stalks of } \mathcal{V}_{rh} \text{ along } C_{s_i w} \text{ are nonzero}\}$.

Proof. For $J \subset I_{L(\lambda)}$, let P_J denote the corresponding parabolic subgroup of G, i.e. with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}_J + \mathfrak{n}^+$. Then it is well known that the perverse sheaf corresponding to $M(\lambda, J)$ is $j_! \mathbb{C}_{P_J w B/B}[\ell(w)]$.

The map $M(\lambda, I_V) \to V \to 0$ yields a surjection on the corresponding perverse sheaves. By considering Jordan–Hölder content, it follows this map is an isomorphism when restricted to $\mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}}$, as for $y \leqslant w$ the only intersection cohomology sheaves $\mathcal{IC}_y := \mathcal{IC}_{X_y}$ which do not vanish upon restriction are $\mathcal{IC}_w, \mathcal{IC}_{s_i w}, i \in I_{L(\lambda)}$. We finish by observing:

$$j^*_{\mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}}} j_! \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}}[\ell(w)] \simeq j_! \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_{L(\lambda)}} \cap P_{I_V} w B/B}[\ell(w)] = j_! \mathbb{C}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}}[\ell(w)]. \qquad \square$$

We deduce the following D-module interpretation of integrability:

Corollary 8.5. *Let $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{U}$ be as above. The restriction of $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}$ to $\mathcal{U}$ is $j_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}}$. If we define $I_{\mathcal{V}} := \{i \in I : \text{the fibers of } \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V} \text{ are nonzero along } C_{s_i w}\}$, then $I_{\mathcal{V}} = I_V$. Here we mean fibers in the sense of the underlying quasi-coherent sheaf of $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}$.*

Before proving Theorem 8.1, we first informally explain the proof. Proposition 8.2 says that for $i \in I_{L(w \cdot -2\rho)}$, the action of the corresponding $\mathfrak{sl}_2 \to \mathfrak{g}$ on V is not integrable if and only if $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ has a 'pole' on the Schubert divisor $X_{s_i w}$. Therefore to modify V so that it loses integrability along $X_{s_i w}$, we will restrict $\mathcal{V}_{rh}$ to the complement and then extend by zero.

Proof of Theorem 8.1. For ease of notation, write $X := X_w$. Write $X = Z \sqcup U$, where Z is as above, and $G/B = Z \sqcup \tilde{U}$. Note $\tilde{U} \cap X_w = U$. Write $j_U : U \to X_w, j_{\tilde{U}} : \tilde{U} \to G/B$ for the open embeddings, and $i_Z : Z \to X_w, i'_Z : Z \to G/B, i_{X_w} : X_w \to G/B$ for the closed embeddings.

We will study $H^0(\tilde{U}, \mathcal{V})$ by studying the behavior of $\mathcal{V}$ on U, i.e. before pushing off of X_w. Formally, write $\mathcal{V}_{rh} = i_{X*} i_X{}^* \mathcal{V}_{rh} =: i_{X*} \mathcal{P}$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is perverse. The distinguished triangle:

$$j_{U!} j_U{}^* \to \mathrm{id} \to i_{Z*} i_Z{}^* \xrightarrow{+1} \tag{8.6}$$

gives the following exact sequence in perverse cohomology:

$$0 \to {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^{-1}\, i_{Z*} i_Z{}^* \mathcal{P} \to {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \to {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, i_{Z*} i_Z{}^* \mathcal{P} \to 0.$$

We now show in several steps that ${}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P}$ is a highest weight module with the desired integrability.

Step 1: ${}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P}$ *is a highest weight module of highest weight* $w \cdot -2\rho$.

By definition, we have a surjection $j_{C_w!}\mathbb{C}_{C_w}[\ell(w)] \to \mathcal{P} \to 0$. Since $j_{C_w!}\mathbb{C}_{C_w}$ is supported off of the Schubert divisors, we have $j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathbb{C}_{C_w} \simeq \mathbb{C}_{C_w}$. By right exactness, we obtain $j_{C_w!}\mathbb{C}_{C_w}[\ell(w)] \to {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P} \to 0$, as desired. We remark that similarly, ${}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, i_{Z*} i_Z{}^* \mathcal{P} = 0$.

Step 2: The integrability of ${}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P}$ *is* J. In 'ground to earth' terms, by Proposition 8.2 we need to look at this sheaf on $\mathcal{U}$, where by design it has the correct behavior. More carefully, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} j_{\mathcal{U}}^*\, {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P} &\simeq {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{\mathcal{U}}^* j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P} \\ &\simeq {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{\mathcal{U}\cap U!} j_{\mathcal{U}\cap U}^* \mathcal{P} \\ &\simeq {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{\mathcal{U}\cap U!} j_{\mathcal{U}\cap U}^* j_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}!}\mathbb{C}[\ell(w)] \\ &\simeq {}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}\cap U_!}\mathbb{C}[\ell(w)] = j_{\mathcal{U}_{I_V}\cap U_!}\mathbb{C}[\ell(w)]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathcal{U}_{I_V} \cap U = \mathcal{U}_J$, we are done by Proposition 8.2.

We now push our analysis off of X_w. To do so, we use the isomorphism of distinguished triangles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* i_{X*} & \longrightarrow & i_{X*} & \longrightarrow & i'_{Z!} i'_Z{}^* i_{X*} & \xrightarrow{+1} & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ i_{X*} j_{U!} j_U{}^* & \longrightarrow & i_{X*} & \longrightarrow & i_{X*} i_{Z*} i_Z{}^* & \xrightarrow{+1} & \end{array} \tag{8.7}$$

Here the middle vertical map is the identity, and the left and right vertical isomorphisms are induced by adjunction. Plainly, the isomorphism (8.7) comes from an isomorphism of short exact sequences of functors for the abelian categories of sheaves of abelian groups.

Translating our analysis of ${}^{\mathrm{p}}\mathrm{H}^0\, j_{U!} j_U{}^* \mathcal{P}$ into the corresponding statement for $\mathfrak{g}$-modules and using Equation (8.7), we obtain a surjection of highest weight modules:

$$\Gamma(G/B, H^0 j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* \mathcal{V}) \to V \to 0,$$

where the former module has integrability J. To finish the proof of Theorem 8.1, it remains only to identify the dual of $\Gamma(G/B, H^0 j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* \mathcal{V})$ with sections of $\mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}$ on $\tilde{U}$. But using standard compatibilities of $\mathbb{D}$, and of composition of derived functors, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}\Gamma(G/B, H^0 j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* \mathcal{V}) &\simeq \Gamma(G/B, \mathbb{D}H^0 j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* \mathcal{V}) \\ &\simeq \Gamma(G/B, H^0 \mathbb{D} j_{\tilde{U}!} j_{\tilde{U}}^* \mathcal{V}) \\ &\simeq \Gamma(G/B, H^0 R j_{\tilde{U}*} j_{\tilde{U}}{}^* \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}) \\ &\simeq \Gamma(G/B, j_{\tilde{U}*} j_{\tilde{U}}^* \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}) \\ &\simeq \Gamma(\tilde{U}, \mathbb{D}\mathcal{V}). \end{aligned}$$

□

If one thinks about the above proof, in fact all we used about U (and $\tilde{U}$) was the intersection of U with $\mathcal{U}$. The following proposition shows our U has the correct components in codimension $\geqslant 2$ to mimic another feature of Brion's example:

Proposition 8.8. *The construction of Theorem 8.1 sends parabolic Verma modules to parabolic Verma modules.*

Proof. For $J \subset K \subset I_{L(w\cdot -2\rho)}$, we know that $M(w\cdot -2\rho, K)$ corresponds to $j_!\mathbb{C}_{P_KwB/B}$, where P_K is the parabolic subgroup corresponding to $K \subset I$. Applying the construction (before taking perverse cohomology), we obtain $j_{U!}j_U^*j_!\mathbb{C}_{P_KwB/B} \simeq j_!\mathbb{C}_{U\cap P_KwB/B}$. The claim follows from the identity $P_KwB/B \setminus Z = P_JwB/B$, i.e. the identity

$$W_Kw \setminus \cup_{k\in K\setminus J}\{y \in W : y \leqslant s_kw\} = W_Jw.$$

To see this identity, recall by [5, Exercise 2.26 and proof of Proposition 2.4.4] that the assignment $w_kw \mapsto w_kw_\circ$ is an isomorphism of posets $W_Kw \simeq W_K$, where $w_\circ$ is the longest element of W_K. Multiplying the claimed identity on the right by w^{-1}, it is therefore equivalent to:

$$W_K \setminus \cup_{k\in K\setminus J}\{y \in W_K : y \geqslant s_k\} = W_J,$$

which is clear. □

While the results in this section concern $\mathfrak{g}$ of finite type, we expect and would be interested to see that similar results hold for $\mathfrak{g}$ symmetrizable.

9. Highest weight modules over symmetrizable quantum groups

We now extend many results of the previous sections to highest weight modules over quantum groups $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, for $\mathfrak{g}$ a Kac–Moody algebra. Given a generalized Cartan matrix A, as for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$, to write down a presentation for the algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ via generators and explicit relations, one uses the symmetrizability of A. When $\mathfrak{g}$ is non-symmetrizable, even the formulation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is subtle and is the subject of active research [20, 9]. In light of this, we restrict to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ where $\mathfrak{g}$ is symmetrizable.

9.1. **Notation and preliminaries.** We begin by reminding standard definitions and notation. Fix $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$ for A a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix. Fix a diagonal matrix $D = \mathrm{diag}(d_i)_{i\in I}$ such that DA is symmetric and $d_i \in \mathbb{Q}^{\geqslant 0},\ \forall i \in I$. Let $(\mathfrak{h}, \pi, \check{\pi})$ be a realization of A as before; further fix a lattice $P^\vee \subset \mathfrak{h}$, with $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $\check{\alpha}_i, \check{\beta}_l,\ i \in I,\ 1 \leqslant l \leqslant |I| - \mathrm{rk}(A)$, such that $P^\vee \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C} \simeq \mathfrak{h}$ and $(\check{\beta}_l, \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{Z},\ \forall i \in I,\ 1 \leqslant l \leqslant |I| - \mathrm{rk}(A)$. Set $P := \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* : (P^\vee, \lambda) \subset \mathbb{Z}\}$ to be the weight lattice. We further retain the notations $\rho, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{l}_J, P_J^+, M(\lambda, J), I_{L(\lambda)}$ from previous sections; note we may and do choose $\rho \in P$. We normalize the Killing form $(\cdot,\cdot)$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ to satisfy: $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_ia_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in I$.

Let q be an indeterminate. Then the corresponding quantum Kac–Moody algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra, generated by elements $f_i, q^h, e_i,\ i \in I,\ h \in P^\vee$, with relations given in e.g. [14, Definition 3.1.1]. Among these generators are distinguished elements $K_i = q^{d_i\check{\alpha}_i} \in q^{P^\vee}$. Also define $U_q^\pm$ to be the subalgebras generated by the e_i and the f_i, respectively.

A *weight* of the quantum torus $\mathbb{T}_q := \mathbb{C}(q)[q^{P^\vee}]$ is a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra homomorphism $\chi : \mathbb{T}_q \to \mathbb{C}(q)$, which we identify with an element $\mu_q \in (\mathbb{C}(q)^\times)^{2|I|-\mathrm{rk}(A)}$ given an enumeration of $\check{\alpha}_i,\ i \in I$. We will abuse notation and write $\mu_q(q^h)$ for $\chi_{\mu_q}(q^h)$. There is a partial ordering on the set of weights, given by: $q^{-\nu}\mu_q \leqslant \mu_q$, for all weights $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi$. We will mostly be concerned with *integral* weights $\mu_q = q^\mu$ for $\mu \in P$, which are defined via: $q^\mu(q^h) = q^{(h,\mu)},\ h \in P^\vee$.

Given a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module V and a weight μ_q, the corresponding *weight space* of V is:

$$V_{\mu_q} := \{v \in V : q^hv = \mu_q(q^h)v\ \forall h \in P^\vee\}.$$

Denote by $\operatorname{wt} V$ the set of weights $\{\mu_q : V_{\mu_q} \neq 0\}$. A $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module is *highest weight* if there exists a nonzero weight vector which generates V and is killed by e_i, $\forall i \in I$. For a weight μ_q, let $M(\mu_q), L(\mu_q)$ denote the Verma and simple $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules of highest weight μ_q, respectively.

Writing λ_q for the highest weight of V, the *integrability* of V equals:

$$I_V := \{i \in I : \dim \mathbb{C}(q)[f_i]V_{\lambda_q} < \infty\}. \tag{9.1}$$

In this case, the parabolic subgroup W_{I_V} acts on $\operatorname{wt} V$ by

$$s_i(\lambda_q)(q^h) := \lambda_q(q^{\check{\alpha}_i})^{-\alpha_i(h)}\lambda_q(q^h), \qquad h \in P^\vee.$$

The braid relations can be checked using by specializing q to 1, cf. [27]. In particular, $w(q^\lambda) = q^{w\lambda}$ for $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in P$.

Given a weight λ_q and $J \subset I_{L(\lambda_q)}$, the parabolic Verma module $M(\lambda_q, J)$ co-represents the functor:

$$M \rightsquigarrow \{m \in M_{\lambda_q} : e_i m = 0 \ \forall i \in I, \quad f_j \text{ acts nilpotently on } m, \forall j \in J\}. \tag{9.2}$$

Note $\lambda_q(q^{\check{\alpha}_j}) = \pm q^{n_j}$, $n_j \geqslant 0$, $\forall j \in J$ cf. [18, Proposition 2.3]. Therefore:

$$M(\lambda_q, J) \simeq M(\lambda_q)/(f_j^{n_j+1} M(\lambda_q)_{\lambda_q}, \forall j \in J). \tag{9.3}$$

In what follows, we will specialize highest weight modules at $q = 1$, as pioneered by Lusztig [27]. Let A_1 denote the local ring of rational functions $f \in \mathbb{C}(q)$ that are regular at $q = 1$. Fix an integral weight $\lambda_q = q^\lambda \in q^P$ and a highest weight module V with highest weight vector $v_{\lambda_q} \in V_{\lambda_q}$. Then the classical limit of V at $q = 1$, defined to be $V^1 := A_1 \cdot v_{\lambda_q}/(q-1)A_1 \cdot v_{\lambda_q}$, is a highest weight module over $U(\mathfrak{g})$ with highest weight λ. Moreover the characters of V and V^1 are "equal", i.e. upon identifying q^P with P.

9.2. **A classification of highest weight modules to first order.** We begin by extending Theorem 1.1 to quantum groups.

Theorem 9.4. *Let V be a highest weight module with integral highest weight λ_q. The following data are equivalent:*

(1) *I_V, the integrability of V.*
(2) *$\operatorname{conv} V^1$, the convex hull of the specialization of V.*
(3) *The stabilizer of $\operatorname{ch} V$ in W.*

Proof. The equivalence of the three statements follows from their classical counterparts, using the equality of characters under specialization. □

9.3. **A question of Bump on the weights of non-integrable simple modules.** We now extend the results of Section 5 to quantum groups.

Theorem 9.5. *Let λ_q be integral. The following are equivalent:*

(1) $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, I_V)$.
(2) $\operatorname{wt}_{I_V^p} V = q^{-\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I_V^p}\lambda_q}$, *where* $I_V^p = I_{L(\lambda_q)} \setminus I_V$.

In particular, if V is simple, or more generally $|I_V^p| \leqslant 1$, then $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, I_V)$.

To prove Theorem 9.5, we will need the Integrable Slice Decomposition for quantum parabolic Verma modules.

Proposition 9.6. *Let λ_q be an integral weight and $M(\lambda_q, J) =: V$ a parabolic Verma module. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, J) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_J)} \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(q^{-\mu}\lambda_q), \tag{9.7}$$

where $L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\nu)$ denotes the simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l}_J)$-module of highest weight ν. In particular, $\operatorname{wt} V^1 = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_1, J)$.

Proof. It suffices to check the formula after specialization. Since the characters of V and V^1 are "equal", $I_V = I_{V^1}$. It therefore suffices to check the surjection $M(\lambda_1, J) \to V^1$ induces an equality of weights. By the Integrable Slice Decomposition 4.1, it suffices to show that $q^{-\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi_{I \setminus J}}\lambda_q \subset \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, J)$. But this is clear from (9.3) by considering weights and using that $f_j^{n_j+1} M(\lambda_q)_{\lambda_q}$ is a highest weight line, for all $j \in J$. □

Remark 9.8. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is of finite type, then in fact $V^1 \simeq M(\lambda_1, J)$. The proof uses [4, Chapter 2] and the PBW theorem, as well as arguments similar to the construction of Lusztig's canonical basis [28] to define $U_q(\mathfrak{u}_J^-)$. It would be interesting to know if the parabolic Verma module $M(\lambda_q, J)$ specializes to $M(\lambda_1, J)$ for all symmetrizable $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proof of Theorem 9.5. By Proposition 9.6, (1) implies (2). For the converse, by the Integrable Slice Decomposition (9.7), it suffices to show that $q^{-\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_{I_V})}\lambda_q \subset \operatorname{wt} V$. This follows by mimicking the proof of Theorem 5.1. □

As an application of Theorem 9.5, we obtain the following positive formulas for weights of simple modules $\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda_q)$.

Proposition 9.9. *Suppose λ_q is integral. Write $\mathfrak{l}$ for the Levi subalgebra corresponding to $I_{L(\lambda_q)}$, and write $L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\nu_q)$ for the simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ module with highest weight ν_q. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda_q) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}\pi \setminus \pi_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}} \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}}(q^{-\mu}\lambda_q). \tag{9.10}$$

Proposition 9.11. *Let λ_q be integral and $V := L(\lambda_q)$. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} V^1 = (\lambda + \mathbb{Z}\pi) \cap \operatorname{conv} V^1. \tag{9.12}$$

By specialization, this determines the weights of $L(\lambda_q)$.

Proposition 9.13. *Suppose λ_q is integral and has finite $W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}$-isotropy. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda_q) = \bigcup_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}} w\{q^\nu : \nu \in P^+_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}},\ q^\nu \leqslant \lambda_q\}. \tag{9.14}$$

9.4. **A question of Lepowsky on the weights of highest weight modules.** The result and arguments of Section 6 apply without change to quantum groups.

Theorem 9.15. *Fix $J \subset I_{L(\lambda_q)}$ and define $J_q^p := I_{L(\lambda_q)} \setminus J$. The following are equivalent:*

1. $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, J)$ *for every V with $I_V = J$.*
2. *The Dynkin diagram for $\mathfrak{g}_{J_q^p}$ is complete.*

9.5. **The Weyl–Kac formula for the weights of simple modules.** The main result of Section 7 follows from combining Theorems 7.1, 9.5, Proposition 9.6, and specializing.

Theorem 9.16. *For all integral λ_q with finite stabilizer in $W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}$, we have:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda_q) = \sum_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}} w \frac{\lambda_q}{\prod_{\alpha \in \pi}(1 - q^{-\alpha})}. \tag{9.17}$$

9.6. **The case of non-integral weights.** We now explain how to extend the above results in this section to other highest weights. We do so in two ways. First, we observe that with some modifications, Lusztig's specialization method applies to any weight λ_q such that $\lambda_q(q^h)$ is regular at $q = 1$ with value 1, $\forall h \in P^\vee$. Calling such weights *specializable*, one can show that as before, a highest weight module with specializable highest weight λ_q specializes to a highest weight $U(\mathfrak{g})$-module with highest weight $\lambda_1 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, given by:

$$(h, \lambda_1) := \left. \frac{\lambda_q(q^h) - 1}{q - 1} \right|_{q=1}, \qquad h \in P^\vee.$$

Moreover, the following holds:

Theorem 9.18. *The above results in this section all extend to λ_q specializable.*

Second, we extend many of the above results to generic highest weights, i.e. with finite integrable stabilizer. In particular, this covers all cases in finite and affine type, the remaining cases in affine type being trivial modules. As before, we obtain:

Theorem 9.19. *Fix a weight λ_q and a highest weight module V such that the stabilizer of its highest weight λ_q in W_{I_V} is finite. The following are equivalent:*

(1) $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, I_V)$.

(2) $\operatorname{wt}_{I_V^p} V = q^{-\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0} \pi_{I_V^p}} \lambda_q$, *where* $I_V^p = I_{L(\lambda_q)} \setminus I_V$.

In particular, if V is simple, or more generally $|I_V^p| \leqslant 1$, then $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, I_V)$.

To prove Theorem 9.19, we will need the Integrable Slice Decomposition for quantum parabolic Verma modules.

Proposition 9.20. *Let $M(\lambda_q, J)$ be a parabolic Verma module such that the stabilizer of λ_q in W_J is finite. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, J) = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_J)} \operatorname{wt} L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(q^{-\mu} \lambda_q), \tag{9.21}$$

where $L_{\mathfrak{l}_J}(\nu)$ denotes the simple $U_q(\mathfrak{l}_J)$-module of highest weight ν.

Proof. The inclusion $\supset$ follows from considering weights as in Proposition 4.1. The inclusion $\subset$ follows by using Proposition 4.3(2), which holds for quantum groups by specialization to $q = 1$. □

Proof of Theorem 9.19. By Proposition 9.20, (1) implies (2). For the converse, by the Integrable Slice Decomposition (9.21), it suffices to show that $q^{-\mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0}(\pi \setminus \pi_{I_V})} \lambda_q \subset \operatorname{wt} V$. This follows by mimicking the proof of Theorem 5.1. □

As an application of Theorem 9.19, Equation (9.10) holds on the nose for all λ_q with finite stabilizer in $W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}$, and Equation (9.14) holds, rephrased as follows:

Proposition 9.22. *Suppose λ_q has finite $W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}$-isotropy. Then:*

$$\operatorname{wt} L(\lambda_q) = \bigcup_{w \in W_{I_{L(\lambda_q)}}} w\{\nu_q : \nu_q \leqslant \lambda_q,\ \nu_q(q^{\check{\alpha}_i}) = \pm q^{n_i}, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geqslant 0},\ \forall i \in I_{L(\lambda_q)}\}. \tag{9.23}$$

Finally, we extend the results of Section 6 to quantum groups, as the same proof applies.

Theorem 9.24. *Fix λ_q and $J \subset I_{L(\lambda_q)}$ such that the stabilizer of λ_q in W_J is finite, and define $J_q^p := I_{L(\lambda_q)\setminus J}$. The following are equivalent:*

(1) $\operatorname{wt} V = \operatorname{wt} M(\lambda_q, J)$ *for every V with $I_V = J$.*
(2) *The Dynkin diagram for $\mathfrak{g}_{J_q^p}$ is complete.*

References

[1] Tomoyuki Arakawa and Peter Fiebig. The linkage principle for restricted critical level representations of affine Kac–Moody algebras. *Compos. Math.*, 148(6):1787–1810, 2012.
[2] Michael F. Atiyah and Raoul Bott. A Lefschetz fixed point formula for elliptic complexes. II. Applications. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:451–491, 1968.
[3] Alexander Barvinok. *Integer points in polyhedra*. Zurich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2008.
[4] Christopher P. Bendel, Daniel K. Nakano, Brian J. Parshall, and Cornelius Pillen. Cohomology for quantum groups via the geometry of the nullcone. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 229(1077):x+93, 2014.
[5] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2005.
[6] Michel Brion. Polyèdres et réseaux. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 38(1-2):71–88, 1992.
[7] Michel Brion. Personal communication. 2013.
[8] Gurbir Dhillon and Apoorva Khare. Faces of highest weight modules and the universal Weyl polyhedron. *Preprint, arXiv:1611.00114*, 2016.
[9] Xin Fang. Non-symmetrizable quantum groups: defining ideals and specialization. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 50(4):663–694, 2014.
[10] Edward Frenkel. *Langlands correspondence for loop groups*, volume 103 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
[11] Edward Frenkel and Dennis Gaitsgory. Localization of $\mathfrak{g}$-modules on the affine Grassmannian. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170(3):1339–1381, 2009.
[12] Howard Garland and James Lepowsky. Lie algebra homology and the Macdonald–Kac formulas. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 34(1):37–76, 1976.
[13] Istvan Heckenberger and Stefan Kolb. On the Bernstein–Gelfand–Gelfand resolution for Kac–Moody algebras and quantized enveloping algebras. *Transform. Groups*, 12(4):647–655, 2007.
[14] Jin Hong and Seok-Jin Kang. *Introduction to quantum groups and crystal bases*, volume 42 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
[15] Ronald S. Irving. Singular blocks of the category $\mathcal{O}$. *Math. Z.*, 204(2):209–224, 1990.
[16] Jens C. Jantzen. Kontravariante Formen auf induzierten Darstellungen halbeinfacher Lie-Algebren. *Math. Ann.*, 226(1):53–65, 1977.
[17] Jens C. Jantzen. *Moduln mit einem höchsten Gewicht*, volume 750 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin, 1979.
[18] Jens C. Jantzen. *Lectures on quantum groups*, volume 6 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
[19] Victor G. Kac. *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, third edition, 1990.
[20] Masaki Kashiwara. On crystal bases. In *Representations of groups (Banff, AB, 1994)*, volume 16 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 155–197. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.
[21] Steven N. Kass. A recursive formula for characters of simple Lie algebras. *J. Algebra*, 137(1):126–144, 1991.
[22] Apoorva Khare. Faces and maximizer subsets of highest weight modules. *J. Algebra*, 455:32–76, 2016.
[23] Shrawan Kumar. Demazure character formula in arbitrary Kac–Moody setting. *Invent. Math.*, 89(2):395–423, 1987.

[24] Shrawan Kumar. Bernstein–Gel′fand–Gel′fand resolution for arbitrary Kac–Moody algebras. *Math. Ann.*, 286(4):709–729, 1990.
[25] Shrawan Kumar. *Kac–Moody groups, their flag varieties and representation theory*, volume 204 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
[26] James Lepowsky. A generalization of the Bernstein–Gelfand–Gelfand resolution. *J. Algebra*, 49(2):496–511, 1977.
[27] George Lusztig. Quantum deformations of certain simple modules over enveloping algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 70(2):237–249, 1988.
[28] George Lusztig. Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3(2):447–498, 1990.
[29] Michael Murray and John Rice. A geometric realisation of the Lepowsky Bernstein Gel′fand Gel′fand resolution. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 114(2):553–559, 1992.
[30] Alexander Postnikov. Permutohedra, associahedra, and beyond. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (6):1026–1106, 2009.
[31] Waldeck Schützer. A new character formula for Lie algebras and Lie groups. *J. Lie Theory*, 22(3):817–838, 2012.
[32] Wolfgang Soergel. Kategorie $\mathcal{O}$, perverse Garben und Moduln über den Koinvarianten zur Weylgruppe. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3(2):421–445, 1990.
[33] Mark A. Walton. Polytope sums and Lie characters. In *Symmetry in physics*, volume 34 of *CRM Proc. Lecture Notes*, pages 203–214. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.

Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
E-mail address: G.D. gsd@stanford.edu; A.K. khare@stanford.edu